City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 54.

## AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: SEPTEMBER 13, 2007

| <b>DIRECTOR:</b> M. MARGO W.  |                      | MENT                       | <b>Consent</b> | <b>☑</b> Discussion |
|---|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| SUBJECT: TXT-23597 - TEXT AMENDME VEGAS - Discussion and possible Premise Signs.  |                      |                            |                |                     |
| THIS ITEM WILL BE FORWA   | RDED TO C            | CITY COUNCIL IN O          | RDINANC        | E FORM              |
| PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:   |                      | APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE: |                |                     |
| Planning Commission Mtg.  | 0                    | Planning Commissio         | n Mtg.         | 0                   |
| <b>City Council Meeting</b>   | 0                    | City Council Meeting       | g              | 0                   |
| RECOMMENDATION: NO RECOMMENDATION   |                      |                            |                |                     |
| BACKUP DOCUMENTATION: Conditions and Staff Report   |                      |                            |                |                     |
| Motion made by RICHARD TRUESDELL to Approve subject to conditions and amending the following conditions as read for the record:     |                      |                            |                |                     |
| Section $1(B)(3)(a)$ should read: ?In the case of a time limit, the limit is not less than three years; and"                        |                      |                            |                |                     |
| Section $1(B)(3)(b)$ should read: ?In the case of a periodic review, the review is not sooner than three years after the approval." |                      |                            |                |                     |
| Section 4(G)(2) should read: ?Application for approval under this Subsection (G) shall require a signature of the Applicant.?       |                      |                            |                |                     |
| Section 4(H)(2) should read: Appli signature of the Applicant.?   | cation for app       | proval under this Subsec   | ction (H) sha  | all require a       |
| Passed For: 4; Against: 2; Abstain<br>GLENN TROWBRIDGE, [NAME<br>TRUESDELL; (Against-DAVID S<br>Vote-None); (Excused-BYRON Ge       | NOT FOUN<br>TEINMAN, | D], LEO DAVENPOR           |                |                     |
|   |                      |                            |                |                     |

## Minutes:

CHAIRMAN DAVENPORT declared the Public Hearing open.

## City of Las Vegas Agenda Item No.: 54.

CHRIS KNIGHT, Director of Administrative Services, provided an extensive overview of the City's proposed text amendment relative to billboards. He referenced legislation from 2001 through 2007 that addressed compensation, height adjustments and non-conforming status, property owner and billboard company rights. He enumerated the objectives of both the City and the billboard companies and emphasized that regardless of what action(s) are taken at Planning Commission the recommendations will be forwarded on to the City Council. MR. KNIGHT discussed amendments as negotiated by the City with the billboard industry.

Relative to the review periods, COMMISSIONER EVANS asked about the possibility of reducing the number of years in light of the rapid changes occuring throughout the Valley. With regard to final safety inspections, he asked if the City would be held liable should a problem occur. ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY BRYAN SCOTT stated that the licensed engineers, by certifying, would put themselves on the line. MR. KNIGHT noted that from the Building and Safety standpoint, engineering firms are selected based on qualifications.

COMMISSIONER TROWBRIDGE questioned the illumination levels. MR. KNIGHT related that that particular issue was not addressed in the proposed ordinance. ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY SCOTT clarified that the terminology used refers only to the lights that the illuminate the sign and does not refer to the digital display. In response to embellishments, MR. KNIGHT stated that approval is required for each request and done administratively. COMMISSIONER STEINMAN questioned the placement of embellishments with COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL inquiring about the minimum height placement from the ground. ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY SCOTT explained that the review period refers to the annual or yearly review.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, inquired about the date the Text Amendment will be acted upon by the Recommending Committee.

JAY BROWN, 520 South 4th Street, appeared on behalf of several billboard companies and property owners. He introduced BO PALLEY, CEO and Chairman and JOHN PERREIRA, Orion General Counsel. MR. BROWN contended that filing the permit within a 90-day period is acceptable; however he would like to see a timeframe within which to build the billboard. MR. BROWN believed that the right to file for a permit for any changes to existing billboards should go solely to the property owner. MR. PALLEY concurred with MR. BROWN'S statements. ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY SCOTT defined property owner and stated that any recommendation from the Planning Commission will go forward to the City Council.

PAUL LARSEN, 300 South 4th Street, representing Clear Channel Outdoor believes the draft amendment represents the ability to replace a structure continually void of any conditions or reviews and eliminates the ability for the Planning Commission or the City Council to oversee it. MR. LARSEN stated that Clear Channel would be agreeable to upgrading a non-conformance structure subject to a special use permit giving the City the opportunity to impose conditions and conduct reviews. COMMISSIONER TROWBRIDGE proposed that the City conduct aesthetic reviews.

## City of Las Vegas Agenda Item No.: 54.

JENNIFER LAZOVICH, 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, represented Lamarr Advertising and concurred with MR. LARSEN'S suggestion. She agreed that a review should be done by the Planning Commission and the City Council in a use permit fashion for billboards needing to be voluntarily reconstructed. ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY SCOTT asked whether the suggestion applies to the destruction and re-erection of a billboard.

JOHN DAVID PERREIRA, General Counsel for Orion Outdoor Media, stated that a meeting was held that included representatives from the City and from the billboard industry. At the conclusion, the billboard industry agreed to the entire text amendment. He believes that Clear Channel and Lamarr Advertising are advocating the special use permit in an effort to persuade property owners to continue doing business with them and by doing so, avoid a long time-consuming process.

CHAIRMAN DAVENPORT continued discussion on the appropriate language to use to protect the landowner. ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY SCOTT suggested using applicant to indicate the property owner. He also noted that the SUP is currently in the Code but there is no provision allowing a sign to be completely demolished and re-erected within ninety days. To do so, the draft amendment would have to revised.

CHAIRMAN DAVENPORT declared the Public Hearing closed.